REMARKS

Claims 36-71 are pending, of which claims 36 and 66 are independent method claims. As indicated above, claims 36, 62, 64, and 66 have been amended by this paper.

The Office Action rejected each of the pending independent claims (36 and 66) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,819,004 to Azadegan et al. ("*Azadegan*"). The Office Action rejected the corresponding dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Azadegan* or under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Azadegan* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,569 to Nickerson ("*Nickerson*"), U.S. Patent No. 6,049,316 Nolan et al. ("*Nolan*"), U.S. Patent No. 6,175,650 Sindhu et al. ("*Sindhu*"), U.S. Patent No. 5,617,333 Oyamada et al. ("*Oyamada*"), U.S. Patent No. 5,619,591 Tsang et al. ("*Tsang*"), or U.S. Patent No. 6,003,030 Kenner et al. ("*Kenner*").[1]

Applicants' invention, as claimed for example in independent claim 36, relates to a method of generating a compressed video stream in order to provide a client with remote access to a program running at a server. The method includes executing the program at the server—the program providing a plurality of display commands which represent a user interface for the program, and drawing the user interface for the program on a virtual display at the server. Prior to compressing the user interface for remote display at the client, the method generates a plurality of quantized transform coefficients from the display commands—one or more different quantized transform coefficients are generated for different display commands. Using the coefficients, the method creates a compressed video stream for remotely displaying the user interface at the client as a video stream as opposed to the plurality of display commands provided by the program.

Similarly, Applicants' invention as claimed for example in independent claim 66, also relates to a method of generating a compressed video stream in order to provide a client with remote access to a program running at a server. The method includes executing a program at the server, the program providing a plurality of display commands which represent a user interface for the program, and drawing the user interface for the program on a virtual display at the server.

[1] Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to do so in the future. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status or asserted teachings of the cited art.

Prior to compressing the user interface for remote display at the client, the method sets at least one compression parameter to different values for different display commands. Using the at least one compression parameter, the method creates a compressed video stream from said commands for remotely displaying the user interface at the client as a video stream as opposed to the plurality of display commands provided by the program.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP § 2131. That is, "for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly." MPEP § 706.02. Applicants also note that "[i]n determining that quantum of prior art disclosure which is necessary to declare an applicant's invention 'not novel' or 'anticipated' within section 102, the stated test is whether a reference contains an 'enabling disclosure.'" MPEP § 2121.01. In other words, a cited reference must be enabled with respect to each claim limitation.

Azadegan discloses manually changing the quality of portions of video frames after the frames have been encoded. Col. 2, ll. 5-10. By reviewing the encoded video and manually assigning a priority to specific regions of a video frame, a person indicates that the quality of the specific regions are to be altered. Col. 2, ll. 10-18; col. 34, ll. 19-22. After the regions are defined and the user defined priorities are entered, new quantizer values for each macroblock of a frame are estimated or determined based on both the priority entered by the user and the old quantizer value. Col. 36, ll. 34-38. Then, the number of bits for each frame resulting from the estimated quantizer values is determined, compared to the original number of bits, and adjusted if necessary. Col. 38, ll. 27-31. For example, if there are too many bits, the quantization level of the macroblocks is increased to reduce the number of bits. Col. 38, ll. 56-60. If there are too few bits, the quantization level of the macroblocks is decreased in order to generate more bits. Col. 38, ll. 60-64. Otherwise, if the difference between the original number of bits and the new number of bits is within an acceptable threshold, there is no need to modify the quantization level of the macroblocks. Col. 38, ll. 64-67.

Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that *Azadegan* fails to teach, suggest, or motivate, each and every limitation of Applicants' invention, as claimed for example in independent claims 36 and 66. In particular, *Azadegan* fails to disclose or suggest executing a program at a server that provides a plurality of display commands representing a user interface

for the program, drawing the user interface for the program on a virtual display at the server, and prior to compressing the user interface for remote display at a client, either setting at least one compression parameter to different values for different display commands (claim 66) or generating a plurality of quantized transform coefficients from the display commands, with one or more different quantized transform coefficients being generated for different display commands (claim 36). *Azadegan* also fails to teach or suggest creating a compressed video stream utilizing the compression parameter (claim 66) or coefficients (claim 36) for remotely displaying said user interface at said client as a video stream as opposed to the plurality of display commands provided by the program.

Rather, as indicated above, *Azadegan* discloses reviewing a previously encoded video frame and manually identifying specific regions within the video frame, assigning the specific regions a priority, estimating new quantizer values for video frame macroblocks, and adjusting the level of quantization for the macroblocks to keep the number of bits for the frame approximately equal to the original number of bits. Accordingly *Azadegan* fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of, and therefore fails to anticipate, claims 36 and 66, as amended.

Based on at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to anticipate or make obvious Applicants invention, as claimed for example in independent claims 36 and 66. Applicants note for the record that the remarks above render the remaining rejections of record for the independent and dependent claims moot, and thus addressing individual rejections or assertion with respect to the teachings of the cited art is unnecessary at the present time, but may be undertaken in the future if necessary or desirable, and Applicants reserve the right to do so.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining any impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 26th day of July 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
ERIC M. KAMERATH
Registration No. 46,081
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

RDN:JCJ:cm
CM0000003587V001